



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

τοίχους δ' εἶχε καὶ τὴν ὀροφὴν κυπαρίττου τὰς δὲ θύρας ἐλέφαντος καὶ θύου. This was the kind of seagoing environment that our Paetus was fit for, not the rough work of the deck that the mannish Roman lady of Juvenal delighted in (*duros gaudet tractare rudentis*)."

In the matter of selections the fourth edition differs only in the addition of V, VII and XLV to Catullus. But why was the *vivamus, mea Lesbia*, which echoes down the ages in scores of imitations,<sup>1</sup> why was the *quot mihi basiationes*, which is scarcely less famous, ever left out at all? These be parlous questions. And where is that interview with Varus's *grisette*, where is Marrucinus, the would-be "funny" man, where is Suffenus—quem probe nosti—and Egnatius, with his *fou rire*, and Fabullus's dinner-invitation? The principle of selection from Ovid is also far from clear to me. But people will always differ in the matter of selections from their favorite authors. Who has ever seen an anthology that was satisfactory in this respect? Of course, one must select from a poet as voluminous as Ovid. But Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, are all compact. They are also three of the greatest among Roman poets. Why do we always read them in selections? However, whether we read them in selections or not, and to whatever extent we may differ on questions of text or interpretation it is certain that Schulze's excellent book is one of the best we have on the subject. It has already gone through three editions and has borne the practical test of constant use for nearly quarter of a century.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. C. Seaton, M. A. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano.

In editing the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius Merkel's work must always be reckoned with. His great service consists

<sup>1</sup> For example, Baif's

Vivons, mignonne, vivons  
Et suivons  
Les ébats qu' Amour nous donne  
Sans que des vieux reçoignés  
Renfrognés  
Le sot babil nous étonne.  
  
Les jours qui viennent et vont  
Se refont :  
Le soleil mort se relève,  
Mais une trop longue nuit  
Las, nous suit  
Après une clarté brève, etc.

in having recognized the primacy of Codex Laurentianus XXXII, 9 as a source of the text. That Merkel had the right of it in throwing aside the *textus receptus* and basing his edition upon Laurentianus, will not be called in question. But his text is not final. There is another stream of tradition, although it is by no means so easy to define; and of this second tradition Merkel was not always duly regardful. It is therefore worth while to think over and work over the whole material from an independent point of view. Mr. Seaton, the editor of the Oxford text, while he accepts substantially Merkel's position, has approached his author in a spirit of independence. The result, as it lies before us in the new edition, is a conservative one. The editor has allowed himself a few slight changes, and while he shows familiarity with the efforts that have been made by others since Merkel's time to emend the text, he has been slow to set aside a tolerable reading, based upon evidence, for any conjecture whatsoever. In such passages as II 1127, III 892, 1384, where the manuscripts have difficult or impossible readings, Seaton has preferred to keep the tradition and mark the passage as corrupt rather than to accept Merkel's suggestions. The conjectures that are noted in the commentary suggest, for the most part, that a difficulty exists or that another reading is possible: not many of the recent conjectures are incorporated into the text. A few examples may be given of wise departure from Merkel. In III 644, Madvig's *σβέσαι* for *σβέσοι* of the manuscripts is adopted, and thus the only future optative with *κέ* is eliminated from the *Argonautica*. In III 980, Merkel kept the reading of L, *ἀλλήλοις ἰκάνομεν*, which involved the lengthening of *iota* in *ἰκάνομεν*. Following codex Guelferbytanus and the metrical procedure of the poet, Seaton gives *ἀλλήλοισιν ἰκάνομεν*. In II 298, III 1147, Seaton adopts Spitzner's emendation *διέτμαγεν*, in place of *διέτμαγον* of Merkel and the manuscripts. There is no reason for assuming a 2d aor. active form *διέτμαγον* with intransitive sense, and this same error has been banished from the text of the *Iliad*. In IV 203, the vocative *φῖλοι* occurring in the middle of a verse and of a sentence and before *τε*, is disturbing. Seaton has followed Guelf. in writing *φίλην*. In III 745, *ναῦται* has long been under fire, and Seaton himself formerly held it to be objectionable (*Am. J. Phil.* X 467): but following Rzach (*Wiener Studien* 1881, p. 58) who offers Homeric parallels for *αι* as long in the first thesis before hiatus, Seaton has set *ναῦται* in the text. In IV 1523, Seaton adopts Brunck's emendation *ἄλγος* for *ἔλκος*. Merkel kept the latter in deference to manuscript authority. These instances, which might easily be multiplied, may serve to show that Seaton has gone his own way and has not set out to reproduce Merkel's text. In general, the new edition is marked not only by conservatism, but by a knowledge of the author's vocabulary, and by good judgment in the selection of individual readings when the evidence compels the editor to choose one of two alternatives.

Considered as a critical edition, the new text raises various points that are worthy of discussion. The proportion of dissent in the following remarks is not meant to reflect the total impression which the edition makes upon an attentive reader. It is rather in the interest of discussion upon an author whose works receive all too little attention. First, as to the commentary.

A critical commentary, to be of value, should contain evidence: not necessarily every fact which one might seek in larger works, but what is given ought, for quality, to be evidence. The nature of the evidence which one expects to find in the Oxford edition, is explained in the preface. In the tenth century there were two types of text: the first and best is known to us by means of Laur. XXXII, 9; the second we must determine by the help of Guelferbytanus, Laur. XXXII, 16, and the corrections entered in Laur. XXXII, 9: citations in the Etymologicum Magnum which agree with this second type of text, show that the separation into two types is as old as the fifth or fourth century.

Assuming the correctness of this classification of sources, the readings of L are of the first importance, likewise the agreement of G and L<sup>2</sup> as against L. Such variations between these two families, variations which carry us back at once beyond the time of printed editions, ought always to be given. As a matter of fact, the commentary does not systematically present the evidence in this way. A few examples will suffice to make this point clear. In IV 170, *δερκομένης* is read by Merkel and by Seaton on the authority of L<sup>2</sup> and G. L has the impossible *δερκομένη*. Seaton gives no note. In III 1001, we find *τὴν δὲ καὶ* in the text. In the commentary is noted the fact that L has *οἱ δὲ καὶ*, but no mention is made of the agreement of L<sup>2</sup> and G upon the reading adopted. In II 239, G and L 16 support the reading adopted, *ἦγον*. L's *ἦκεν* is the only fact noted in the commentary. One might, in these cases just cited, infer with approximate correctness upon what authority the text rests, but it would have been far better to give the various strands of evidence. In II 1174, is an interesting grammatical question. L has

οὐδὲ σφιν θέμις ἦεν, ὅτ' ἀντιπέρθεν ἵκοντο—.

Seaton notes L's *ἵκοντο* but adopts *ἵκοντο* without explanation. An *ex silentio* conclusion would be fallacious here, for G has *ἵκοιτο*. The plural *ἵκοντο* is presumably somebody's conjecture on the basis of G's reading; but if any further evidence was attainable it ought to have been given. In IV 145, the reading *εἴσεται*, in which L and G agree, and which is the basis of Merkel's emendation, is not mentioned.

Any increase in the size of the commentary which might become necessary by the method of citation here advocated, would be more than made good by the elimination of the vulgate readings. If the general theory of the text as it is set forth in the preface is the true one—and there is no doubt that it is the true

one—it is a matter of indifference what the vulgate readings may be. The habit of giving such readings is a part of the old theory of a *textus receptus*, handed down from one editor to another and changed here and there by the comparison of new manuscripts or the talent of an emendator. The logic of the doctrine set forth in the preface is that the *textus receptus* is to be discarded; that a printed edition has no authority as evidence save that of the manuscripts upon which it is based; that if a given printed edition preserves readings of a MS not now accessible it ought to be cited by itself, and its evidence as a representative ought to be brought into relation with the two types of text that can be shown to have existed in the tenth century. The point of my criticism, then, is that the preface embodies the modern theory of determining the history of a text as a historical problem, while the commentary is not free from the old leaven of a *textus receptus*. To mark a reading "vulg." is not the citation of evidence: it is rather a bushel under which all sorts of things may be hidden.

Apart from the theory involved, this notation has practical disadvantages. The readings of a manuscript like L are worth knowing even when they are palpably wrong, for they may contain a hint of the truth. They should stand out clearly and not be left to inference. A few examples are here given to show how easily one may draw a wrong inference from the commentary as it is arranged. In IV 1538, L and G give the aor. ἀπετεκμήραντο. Seaton cites this fact and adds, "ἀπετεκμαίροντο vulg." A grammarian might be desirous of learning what authority there is, if any, for the imperfect. The fact that ought to have been stated is that the imperfect is a reading of Stephanus. On the same page, IV 1564 "Ἀτθίδα vulg." should be "Ἀτθίδα codd." This is, to be sure, the reading of the printed editions up to Wellauer's time, but the thing worth knowing is not what has been printed but that the true reading is preserved as a *varia lectio* in the scholia as against all the manuscripts. A fuller statement of the evidence would have been instructive in IV 324 where the genuine reading rests upon the testimony of L<sup>2</sup>, a *varia lectio* in the scholia and a note of Stephanus Byzantius, s. v. καυλικοί, as against L and G.

The important contributions of Rzach to our knowledge of Apollonius Rhodius (*Grammatische Studien zu Apollonius Rhodius*, Wien, 1878; *Wiener Studien*, 1881) have been valued and used by Seaton. Rzach proposes to read in IV 618, instead of μετ' ἀνδράσι κεκλήσται of the MSS μετ' ἀνδράσιν ἐκλήσται. This is in the interest of uniformity. A perfect without the κ of the reduplication is found in IV 267, 990, 1202, and is in each case the only possible metrical form. The fourth and remaining passage is the one in question, and the slight change proposed here would leave ἐκλήσται as the one form used by Apollonius. Seaton's adherence to the manuscript reading as against Rzach seems justifiable, since κεκλήσται is a familiar form and there is here no greater compelling power than the law of uniformity. Some-

times, however, Seaton has been too conservative. We read on p. 5 of the preface: "Rzachius inter alia κοῦραι pro τε κόραι (I 811) et Ἄρεος pro Ἄρεως (II 404) scribenda esse iudicavit, recte, ut opinor; neutrum tamen horum contra codices mutare ausus sum." And yet Ἄρεος has been taken into the text and κοῦραι ought to have been. The case of νεώς, IV 208, for which Rzach proposes to write νεός is somewhat more difficult because the final syllable of the word stands in the arsis and must be long. In defence of such lengthening Rzach cites Odyssey X 172 and Argon. I 289, where a syllable with a vowel naturally short is lengthened under the accent in the arsis of the fourth foot. The strength of Rzach's contention against νεώς, Ἄρεως, κόραι, is not that they are isolated forms but that they are contrary to the law of epic usage. They are Attic, not epic. The same holds true of the dative pl. αἰσι, which is nowhere allowed to appear in the Oxford edition, and of βαρεῖα, IV 1339, which long stood in the printed texts on very slender authority and which Wellauer rightly interpreted as βαρεῖη. The same objection obtains against πρόραν, I 372, which Seaton has adopted on the testimony of L 16. The epic genitive πρόρης (II 556) might conceivably have πρόρην or πρόρην, not πρόραν, as its accusative. If a dissyllabic word is to be retained πρόρην is the only tolerable form, and that is the form adopted by Lehrs. But there are signs which point to a trisyllabic word as the desideratum. L and G have ἡδὲ κατὰ πρόραν ἔσω ἄλδς ὁσσάτιόν περ. This is a faulty verse, metrically. The question then is, where is the fault? Brunck, without knowing the reading of L 16, pronounced ἔσω corrupt and proposed εἴσω. But this conjecture builds upon the unepic form πρόραν. Now assuming that ἔσω is sound and that -ραν is to be interpreted as short according to the law of epic speech, we reach the conclusion that the difficulty is with the first part of the πρόραν of the MSS. The emendation of Bergk, πρόειραν, accepted by Merkel, satisfies the conditions of the problem. The soundness of this reasoning rests upon the two facts, that ἔσω has the weight of authority and that πρόραν is for the epic speech an incredible form. Then the reading of L 16 is to be interpreted not as a good tradition but as a conjecture by some anonymous scholar who anticipated Brunck.

In matters of orthography, the following points may be noted. In obedience to evidence from various sources and in keeping with the best usage of the present day, θνήσκω and θρώσκω appear with iota subscript, the former without any manuscript authority in Apollonius, and the latter with L's testimony in III 957, IV 42, 603. The derivative noun θρωσμός, has φ in L, II 823, although not in III 199. Seaton has preferred θρωσμός, although the other form is known to the grammarians and is found in Ven. A of the Iliad as well as in Laurentianus. The scrupulousness of L in these lesser points is one of the characteristic features of the manuscript. It has διχῆ IV 289, (Seaton διχῆ), just as it stands alone in giving πάντη (so Seaton) in 7 of the 13 cases of its occur-

rence in the poem. The general evidence for iota subscript in *μμήνσκω* is substantially the same as that for *η* and *ω* in the two verbs above given, (see Fleckeisen's *Jahrb.* 1865, 245 ff.) but Seaton has not introduced the form in II 1140, the only passage where the word occurs.

The adoption of *δπιπτεύω* rather than *δπιπεύω* is in the face of a strong array of testimony. In II 406, III 1137, L and G agree in *δπιπτεύω*; in IV 469 L has *δπηπένω* with correction *δπιπεύω*; IV 799, L has *δπιπεύω*. L has, then, in two instances preserved the form *δπιπεύω*, and stands alone in this save for two Vatican MSS. That this is the true orthography is clear from epic usage and the tradition of lexicographers. Since Bekker *δπιπτεύω* has been banished from Homer, and that, too, upon evidence. The epic compound *παρθενοπίπης* is in point. Paley and Rzach, in Hesiod's Works, 29 and 806, edit *δπιπεύω*, following codex Laur. XXXII 16 of Hesiod. Apollonius Sophistes, Photius, Suidas and Hesychius give *δπιπεύω*. Accordingly Kinkel in Lycophron's *Alexandra* 45 gives *δπιπεύω* as against the MSS. The article in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* s. v. *δπιπτεύω* needs revising as to orthography, for not one of the examples there cited has a firm foundation.

In conclusion I will mention one more matter of editorial detail, which may serve incidentally to justify and render intelligible Merkel's robust faith in L. This manuscript has *προβαθής*, IV 283; G, and presumably the other manuscripts have *προβαθός*. Merkel adopted *προβαθής*, Seaton *προβαθός*. If the former is correct, we have an adjective in *-us* carried over to the class in *-ης* upon becoming a compound word. This is the only occurrence, to my knowledge, of this particular word, but the principle is a well-established one. *ἀγχυβαθής*, IV 1572, is as old as Homer. *μελαμβαθείος*, IV 516, is to be referred to a nom. *μελαμβαθής*, found in Aesch. *Prom.* 219. *προβαθής* is the opposite of Strabo's *προσβραχής*. Besides, Apollonius has *πολυθαρσής*, II 912, as Homeric form, and *περιθαρσής*, I 152, 195, a form peculiar to himself. *ποδώκης* is a familiar epic example of the same formation. In later times *τηλεβαθής*, *πολυβαθής*, *ἀμετροβαθής*, *ισοβαθής*, *ἀβαθής* occur; but no compound with the ending *-us*. The form *προβαθής* is therefore, in keeping with the habit of the language and is a significant token of a good manuscript, whereas *προβαθός* is easily understood as a blunder. The question has been decided in principle in the text of Aeschylus. The form *μελαμβαθός*, *Prom.* 219, found its way into the earlier printed texts from inferior manuscripts, but has long since been banished and forgotten. It is safe to say that *προβαθής* will eventually stand in the Oxford text of Apollonius and find its way thence into Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*.

HAMILTON COLLEGE,  
CLINTON, N. Y.

EDWARD FITCH.